

OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

P.O. BOX 942896 SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001 (916) 653-6624 Fax: (916) 653-9824 calshpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

received January 30, 2006

November 7, 2005

Reply To: STB050725A

Victoria Ruston, Chief Surface Transportation Board Office of Economics, Environmental Analysis, and Administration 1925 K Street, N.W. Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20423

AB-980X

Re: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority—Abandonment Exemption—In Santa Clara County and Alameda County, California (San Jose Industrial Lead)(WP Milpitas Line); Docket No. AB-980

Dear Ms. Ruston:

Thank you for the continued consultation regarding the above referenced undertaking. You are requesting, on behalf of the Surface Transportation Board (STB), my assistance in assessing any potential effects of the abandonment action in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470f), as amended. More specifically you are requesting my concurrence with a finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" for the undertaking.

As I presently understand it, the undertaking consists of the abandonment of common carrier obligations for a portion of a rail line (Industrial line) in Santa Clara County, California and a portion of a second rail line (Milpitas line) in Alameda County, California. The Industrial line extends 1.19 miles from milepost 16.30 to milepost 17.49 in Santa Clara County and the Milpitas line extends 2.77 miles from milepost 2.61 near Paseo Padre Drive to milepost 5.38 near Grimmer Boulevard in and near the City of Fremont in Alameda County. There is one railroad bridge within these portions of the subject lines.

After reviewing the additional materials you sent me in your 17 November 2005 letter, which I had requested, I am able to concur that the STB's overall effort to determine and document the APE is satisfactory pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a)(1). Likewise, after reviewing the additional materials sent in your 17 November 2005 letter, I concur that the STB's effort to document historic properties in the APE is satisfactory pursuant to 36 § CFR 800.4(b). I presently understand that there is one bridge within the APE and that it was previously determined ineligible, by consensus with me, in 2004.

I also am able to concur, pursuant to 36 CFR §§ 800.3(e) and (f), that the STB's effort to identify other consulting parties is adequate.

Because there are no historic properties present in the APE, I am able to concur with the STB's finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" for the undertaking.

Thank your for considering historic properties in your planning process. If you have any questions, please contact Amanda Blosser of my staff at (916) 653-6624 or e-mail at ablosser@parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA State Historic Preservation Officer

Stpublilisco for

MWD:ab